

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

TINA CRAWFORD and
JAMES CRAWFORD,

Plaintiff,

Hon. Paul L. Maloney

v.

Case No. 1:20-CV-797

ROSE ACCEPTANCE,

Defendant.

_____ /

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiffs initiated this action August 24, 2020, against their “mortgage company” alleging fraud and related claims. (ECF No. 1). Because Plaintiffs have been permitted to proceed as paupers (ECF No. 4), the Court has reviewed Plaintiffs’ complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) to determine whether it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), the undersigned recommends that Plaintiffs’ complaint be dismissed.

ANALYSIS

A claim must be dismissed for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted unless the “[f]actual allegations [are] enough to raise a right for relief above the speculative level on the assumption that all of the complaint’s allegations are true.”

Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 545 (2007). As the Supreme Court has held, to avoid dismissal, a complaint must contain “sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 677-78 (2009). This plausibility standard “is not akin to a ‘probability requirement,’ but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully.” If the complaint simply pleads facts that are “merely consistent with” a defendant’s liability, it “stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility of ‘entitlement to relief.’” *Id.* As the Court further observed:

Two working principles underlie our decision in *Twombly*. First, the tenet that a court must accept as true all of the allegations contained in a complaint is inapplicable to legal conclusions. Threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice. . . Rule 8 marks a notable and generous departure from the hyper-technical, code-pleading regime of a prior era, but it does not unlock the doors of discovery for a plaintiff armed with nothing more than conclusions. Second, only a complaint that states a plausible claim for relief survives a motion to dismiss. . . Determining whether a complaint states a plausible claim for relief will, as the Court of Appeals observed, be a context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense. But where the well pleaded facts do not permit the court to infer more than the mere possibility of misconduct, the complaint has alleged - but it has not “show[n]” – “that the pleader is entitled to relief.”

Id. at 678-79 (internal citations omitted).

Plaintiffs’ complaint is one-page in length and contains no factual allegations. Instead, Plaintiffs merely assert a variety of legal claims and conclusions. Simply put, Plaintiffs have failed to allege any facts, which, if accepted as true, would entitle them

to relief. Accordingly, the Court finds that Plaintiffs' complaint fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed herein, the undersigned recommends that Plaintiffs' complaint (ECF No. 1) be dismissed for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted.

OBJECTIONS to this Report and Recommendation must be filed with the Clerk of Court within fourteen days of the date of service of this notice. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Failure to file objections within the specified time waives the right to appeal the District Court's order. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir.1981).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 28, 2020

/s/ Phillip J. Green
PHILLIP J. GREEN
United States Magistrate Judge